


UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTCOURT CONFORMATIONCENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIALOS ANGELES COURTHOUSEPLAINTIFF

Related DOJ

CURTIS ADLER

LACV22-3752-JFW-DFMDEFENDANTSSUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTYSUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

BY 	CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES	2022 JUN -2 AM 9:48	FILED

COMPLAINTVIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION RIGHTS : Declaration Of Rights

1. § 7 Due Process: Equal Protection: Privileges And Immunities
2. § 12 Release On Own Recognizance At Court's Discretion
3. § 14 Felony Prosecutions: Arraignment
4. § 15 Safeguards In Criminal Prosecutions
5. § 31 Affirmative Action

Supporting Facts:Superior Court Of Orange County

Federal and California Procedure are neglected by the court. Prosecution proceeds without legal written commitment. Pro per legal actions denied or disregarded with prejudice. Pro per discrimination occurs at every court appearance. Illegal jargon used because the court protects itself with low grade record keeping.

Superior Court Of Los Angeles County

Prosecution proceeds without legal written commitment. Federal and California Procedure are neglected by the court. Pro per legal actions denied or disregarded with prejudice. Pro per discrimination occurs at every court appearance. Illegal jargon used because the court protects itself with low grade record keeping.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTCOMPLAINTROBERT KNOX (JUDGE)

KNOX expressed hate because of ADLER's pro per appearance. KNOX used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. KNOX refused to acknowledge legal jargon and action for defense.

ROBERT BOWER (D.A.)

BOWER expressed hate because of ADLER's pro per appearance. BOWER refused to acknowledge legal jargon for defense.

KEITH SCHWARTZ (JUDGE)

SCHWARTZ expressed hate because of ADLER's pro per appearance. SCHWARTZ used unlawful jargon to hoodwink ADLER's arraignment. SCHWARTZ manipulated sheriff personnel to end arraignment.

CHRISTOPHER DYBWAD (JUDGE)

DYBWAD assumed judge party without notice and proceed prosecution without legal written commitment. DYBWAD neglected procedure.

JEMMA FRANKLIN (D.A.)

FRANKLIN expressed hate because of Adler's pro per appearance. FRANKLIN refused to acknowledge legal jargon for defense.

TALIA LEBOVIC (D.A.)

LEBOVIC expressed hate because of Adler's pro per appearance. LEBOVIC neglected procedure.

YVETTE VERASTEGUI (JUDGE)

VERASTEGUI prepared herself with prejudice because of ADLER's pro per appearance. VERASTEGUI proceeded prosecution without legal written commitment.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COMPLAINT

MATTHEW BROWN (D.A.)

BROWN neglected procedure. BROWN refused to acknowledge legal jargon for defense.

KATHRYN SOLARANZO (JUDGE)

SOLARANZO prepared herself with prejudice, because of Adler's Pro Per appearance. SOLARANZO falsely identified as a judge party while WINDHAM was in charge of the proceeding.

ROBERT WINDHAM (JUDGE)

WINDHAM handled a proceeding as a false judge party; record indicated SOLARANZO was the judge party.

RACHEL HARDIMAN (D.A.)

HARDIMAN neglected procedure. HARDIMAN refuse to acknowledge legal jargon for defense.

WILLIAM SADLER (JUDGE)

SADLER assumed judge party without notice. SADLER proceeded without legal written commitment. SADLER neglected procedure.

Plaintiff alleges that:

COUNT 1. In the years of 2019 and 2020, in Santa Ana, the crime of CORRUPTION, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY, which unlawfully manipulates codes, procedures, and departments to conduct a unfair and obscure process against pro per defendants.

COUNT 2. In the year of 2019 and 2020, in Santa Ana, the crime 9965 PERJURY OR OBSTRUCTION BY A JUDICIAL OFFICER, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by JUDGE, ROBERT KNOX, the accessory to Count 1, who discriminated ADLER because of pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action.

COMPLAINT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COMPLAINT

COUNT 3. In the years of 2021 and 2022, in Los Angeles, the crime of CORRUPTION, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, which unlawfully manipulates codes, procedures, and departments to conduct a unfair and oblige process against pro per defendants.

COUNT 4. In the years of 2019 and 2020, in Santa Ana, the crime of MALPRACTICE, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by DISTRICT ATTORNEY, ROBERT BOWEN, the accessory to count 1, who neglected court procedure.

COUNT 5. On November 9, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of § 96.5 PERVISION OR OBSTRUCTION BY A JUDICIAL OFFICER, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by JUDGE, KEITH SCHWARTZ, the accessory to count 5, who discriminated a defendants pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action.

COUNT 6. On November 29, 2021 and December 13, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of § 96.5 PERVISION OR OBSTRUCTION BY A JUDICIAL OFFICER, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by JUDGE, CHRISTOPHER DUBWAP, the accessory to count 3, who discriminated a defendant's pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action.

COUNT 7. On November 29, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of MALPRACTICE, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by DISTRICT ATTORNEY, JENNA FRANKLIN, the accessory to count 3, who neglected court procedure.

COUNT 8. On December 13, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of MALPRACTICE, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by DISTRICT ATTORNEY, TALIA LEBOVIC, the accessory to count 3, who neglected court procedure.

COUNT 9. On December 27, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of § 96.5 PERVISION OR OBSTRUCTION BY A JUDICIAL OFFICER, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by JUDGE, YVETTE VERASTEGUEI, the accessory to count 3, who discriminated a defendant's pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COMPLAINT

COUNT 10. On December 27, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of MALPRACTICE, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by MATTHEW BROWN, the accessory to count 3, who neglected court procedures.

COUNT 11. On December 27, 2021, in Los Angeles, the crime of § 96.5 PERJURY OR OBSTRUCTION BY A JUDICIAL OFFICER, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by KATHYRN SOLARANZO, the accessory to count 3, who discriminated a defendant's pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action.

COUNT 12. On January 10, 2022, in Los Angeles, the crime of § 96.5 PERJURY OR OBSTRUCTION BY A JUDICIAL OFFICER, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by ROBERT WENDHAM, who discriminated a defendant's pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action. (Accessory to COUNT 5)

COUNT 13. On January 10, 2022 and other case SA105543 court dates, in Los Angeles, the crime of MALPRACTICE, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by RACHEL HARDEMAN, the accessory to count 3, who neglected court procedures.

COUNT 14. On February 14, 2022 and other case SA105543 court dates, in Los Angeles, the crime of MALPRACTICE, in negligence of the Code of California and United States, committed by JUDGE, WILLIAM SADLER, the accessory to count 3, who discriminated a defendant's pro per appearance and disregarded rights and legal action.

DAMAGES being sought:

1. SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

(A) PENAL REDRESS: \$50 for each day served for case 15NF1747, 15NF2142.

California Rights obstructed therefore for each day ADLER served is delinquent.

(B) UNCONSTITUTIONAL DAMAGES: \$31,000 for the negative actions that occurred.

Unconstitutional actions caused immense pain and distress in ADLER's life.

2. SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(A) PENAL REDRESS: \$40 for each day served for case SA105543.

California Rights perjured therefore for each day ADLER served is delinquent.

(B) UNCONSTITUTIONAL DAMAGES: \$25,000 for the negative actions inflicted.

Unconstitutional actions caused immense pain and distress in ADLER's life.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COMPLAINT

RELIEF being sought:

1. SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

(A) CLEAR RECORD.

Cases 15NF1747, 15NF2142 sealed and destroyed.

(B) RESTITUTION FORGIVEN

Restitution balances owed be forgiven and debts cancelled.

2. SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

(A) CASE SA105543 dismissed and destroyed.

I, CURTIS ADLER, declare within the code of California and United States this complaint is legal.

5/28/2022 CURTIS ADLER



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

COURT CONFORMATION

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANT

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

INVESTIGATION REPORT: UNLAWFUL JARGON

1. February - December 2020, Superior Court Of Orange County, Judge Robert Knox
KNOX used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. KNOX refused to acknowledge proper jargon and legal action.
2. 11/09/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W30, Judge Keith Schwartz
SCHWARTZ arrogantly claimed pro per appearance was a bad idea and insisted a public defender to do the arraignment. SCHWARTZ used unlawful jargon to waive arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of Constitution and Statutory Rights.
3. 11/29/2021, 12/13/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W31, Judge Christopher Dybwad
DYBWAD used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. DYBWAD denied arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of Constitution and Statutory Rights.
4. 12/27/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W70, Judge Yvette Verastegui
VERASTEGUI neglected arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of Constitution and Statutory Rights. VERASTEGUI used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. Peremptory challenge was filed against VERASTEGUI and reassignment was illegal.
5. 12/27/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W83, Judge Kathryn Solaranzo
Solaranzo used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process.
6. 1/10/2022, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W83, Judge Robert Windham
SOLARANZO is the judge party on record although problematically Robert Windham was the acting judge. WINDHAM neglected to answer motions in reflection of the code.
7. 2/14/2022, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W80, Judge William Sadler
SADLER neglected arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of Constitution and Statutory Rights. SADLER used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

COURT CONFORMATION

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

INVESTIGATION REPORT: PERVISON

1. February - December 2020, Superior Court of Orange County, Judge Robert Knox
KNOX neglected pro per defense. After two paid attorneys and a year an 6 year sentence was agreed upon with prejudice. Case 15NF2142, 15NF1747
2. 11/09/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W30, Judge Keith Schwartz
Unlawful jargon hoodwinked pro per defendant into a verbal waivers of rights to arraignment, reading of complaint, and Statement of Constitution and Statutory Rights. No legal commitment with order.
3. 11/29/2021, 12/13/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX W31, Judge Christopher Dybwad
DYBWAD assumed acting Judge Party without notice. DYBWAD neglected arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of Constitution and Statutory Rights. DYBWAD used unlawful jargon to hoodwink defense into verbal waiver of reading of complaint and constitutional rights. No legal commitment.
4. 12/27/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX W70, Judge Yvette Verastegui
VERASTEGUI assumed acting Judge Party without notice. VERASTEGUI neglected arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of Constitution and statutory rights. Illegal reassignment after challenge.
5. 12/27/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W83, Judge Kathryn Solaranzo
SOLARANZO neglected arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of constitution and statutory rights. No legal commitment.
6. 1/10/2022, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W83, Judge Robert Windham
WINDHAM who was not the judge on record processed an court record that did not reflect the actual proceedings. No legal commitment.
7. 2/19/2022, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W80, Judge William Sadler
SADLER assumed acting judge party without notice, SADLER neglected arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of constitution rights. SADLER hoodwinked pro per defendant from court appearances. No legal commitment.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COURT CONFORMATION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

INVESTIGATION REPORT: OBSTRUCTION

1. February - December 2020, Superior Court of Orange County, Judge Robert Knox
KNOX used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. KNOX refused to acknowledge legal action such as petitions and motions.
2. 11/09/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W30, Judge Keith Schwartz
SCHWARTZ denied California Constitution Right 7. People's Right § 12. Bail; Release On Own Recognizance At Courts Discretion. SCHWARTZ conducted case proceeding without order for legal commitment.
3. 11/29/2021, 12/13/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W31, Christopher Dybwad
DYBWAD neglected to acknowledge a cross complaint filed. DYBWAD denied California Constitution Rights. DYBWAD conducted case proceeding without order for legal commitment.
4. 12/27/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W70, Judge Yvette Verastegui
VERASTEGUI conducted case proceeding without order for legal commitment.
5. 12/27/2021, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W83, Judge Kathryn Solaranzo
SOLARANZO conducted case proceeding without order for legal commitment.
6. 1/10/2022, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W83, Judge Robert Windham
WINDHAM conducted case proceeding without order for legal commitment and assumed judge party with discrepancies.
7. 2/14/2022, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, LAX Court W80, Judge William Sadler
SADLER conducted case proceeding without order for legal commitment. Several motions filed without answer.

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

COURT CONFORMATION

INVESTIGATION REPORT: MALPRACTICE

1. February - December 2020, Superior Court Of Orange County, District Attorney Bower
BOWER refused to acknowledge pro per rights of defendant. BOWER neglected legal jargon used in defense.
2. 11/29/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, District Attorney Jenna Franklin
FRANKLIN refused to acknowledge pro per rights of defendant. FRANKLIN neglected legal jargon used in defense.
3. 12/13/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, District Attorney Talia Lebovic
LEBOVIC neglected pro per rights of defendant.
4. 11/9/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, District Attorney David Cheng
CHENG filed a unlawful complaint.
5. 12/27/2021, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, District Attorney Matthew Brown
BROWN filed an additional unlawful complaint.
6. 1/10/2021, 2/14/2022, Superior Court Of Los Angeles County, District Attorney Rachel Hardiman
Hardiman neglected pro per rights of defendant. Hardiman refused legal jargon used in defense. Disqualification Of Prosecuting Attorney was filed against Hardiman.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COURT CONFORMATION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIALOS ANGELES COURTHOUSEPLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTSSUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTYSUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTYINVESTIGATION REPORT: CORRUPTION1. SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY, CASE 15NF2142, 15NF1747

Illegally manipulates law enforcement departments and court personnel to conduct a unfair and obscure process against proper defendants. The Federal and State Code is neglected by the court. Court procedure is unlawfully conjured in power to personnel's hate and discrimination. Rights denied with waivers is the norm for many cases, Unfair and obscure process is the cause for pervison, obstruction, and malpractice. 1. §7. Due Process: Rights, Privileges, and Immunities, 1 §15. Safeguards In Criminal Prosecutions, 1. §31. Affirmative Action, 1. §12. Bail: Release On Own Recognizance At Court's Discretion. June 2015 - Present.

2. SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY: CASE SA105543

Illegally manipulates law enforcement departments and court personnel to conduct a unfair and obscure process against proper defendants. Discrimination and Hate goes without consequences. The Federal and State Code is neglected by the court. Court procedure is unlawfully conjured in power to personnel's hate and discrimination. Rights denied with waivers is the norm for many cases. Unfair and obscure process is the cause for pervison, obstruction, and malpractice. 1. §7 Due Process: Rights, Privileges, and Immunities, 1. §15. Safeguards In Criminal Prosecutions, 1. §31. Affirmative Action, 1. §12 Bail: Release On Own Recognizance At Court's Discretion. November 2021 - Present.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COURT CONFORMATION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

v.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

INVESTIGATION REPORT: HATE / DISCRIMINATION / PREJUDICE

1. February - December 2020, Superior Court of Orange County; Judge Robert Knox. District Attorney Robert Bower. KNOX and BOWER expressed hate with tone, manner, and action at every court appearance. Practicing criminal law as pro per defendant is the cause for discrimination. Pro per defense and rights were neglected with prejudice. Petitions and motions were neglected and not on record.
2. 11/9/2021, 11/24/2021, 12/13/2021, 12/27/2021, 1/10/2022, 2/14/2022, 3/7/2022, Judge Keith Schwartz, District Attorney Jenna Franklin, Judge Christopher Dybwad, District Attorney Talia Lebowitz, Judge Yvette Verastegui, District Attorney Matthew Bown, Judge Robert Windham, Judge Kathryn Solvarazo, Judge William Sadler, District Attorney Rachel Hardiman. Judge and District Attorney parties discriminated ADLER for practicing criminal law as a pro per defendant. SCHWARTZ used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. Rights were denied with prejudice. District Attorney Franklin expressed hate and refused to acknowledge pro per rights. DYBWAD used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process and assumed Judge party without notice these were actions of pro per discrimination. District Attorney LEBOWITZ assumed party without notice and prepared proceeding with illegal procedure. VERASTEGUI assumed judge party without notice after recognizing hate; I filed a peremptory challenge. WINDHAM assumed judge party with discrepancy and without notice. SOLVARAZO used unlawful jargon to add perplexity to the process. SADLER was prepared with prejudice because of pro per discrimination. HARDIMAN neglected responsibility as district attorney. Judge and District Attorney parties acted with hate and were discriminatory.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

PAGE 1
COURT CONFORMATION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

v.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

ISSUES

1. JUDGE'S UNIFORM

Judge Uniforms' are black. The legal definition of black is evil, Black is not a color of justice. Judges were black for the sake of intimidation. In the United States colors of justice are red, white, and blue.

2. OBSCURE PROCESS

Pervisions and errors are evident in the law process that is an obstruction to People Rights of the California Constitution and Federal Code. Process lacks technological advancements that would negate problems of the process.

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

AUDIT: ILLEGAL PROCEDURES AND CLERICAL ERRORS

DISREGARD FILING: Superior Court of Orange County

All attempts to filing motions and petitions were disregarded without record.
Ten times on Case ISNF1747, ISNF2142 filings were disregarded.

CLERICAL ERRORS: Superior Court of Orange County

Petitions without legal authentication. Motions and petitions sent in went unconfirmed.
Orders without written legal commitment. More information available at trial.

DISREGARD FILING: Superior Court of Los Angeles County

Motions filed were disregarded without record. Motions filed went unanswered.

CLERICAL ERRORS: Superior Court of Los Angeles County

Files in effect with errors. Complaints filed with illegal procedure. Orders without written legal commitment. More information available at trial.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COURT CONFORMATION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

v.

DEFENDANT

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

AUDIT: UNLAWFUL JARGON / WAIVERSUNLAWFUL JARGON: Superior Court of Orange County

Judge and Attorney parties regularly use unlawful jargon: due to level of dexterity required for law comprehension those pervisions and obstructions occur without justice. More information will be available at trial. (2015 - Present)

UNLAWFUL JARGON: Superior Court of Los Angeles County

Judge and Attorney parties regularly use unlawful jargon due to the level of dexterity required for law comprehension those pervision and obstructions occur without justice. 15 times on Case SA105543 unlawful jargon pervisions occurred. I estimate that unlawful jargon pervisions occurred 2,000 times this year without justice.

WAIVERS: Superior Court of Los Angeles County

The Judge Party hoodwinks defendants to verbally waive rights to a lawful arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of rights: jargon of pervisions. I was hoodwinked four times into waiving rights to arraignment, reading of complaint, and statement of rights. I estimate that hoodwink waiving has occurred 10,000 times this year in neglect to the California Constitution People's Rights.

AUDIT: UNLAWFUL JARGON / WAIVERS

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF

CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

THE MALCORRUPTION DILEMA

Malcorruption is kaput function of a process.

The criminal law process is malcorrupted. The process functions lowly according to the codes and procedures. Codes are essentially unknown. Procedures are in need of a update because the terminology doesn't match up to present time. The Malcorruption Dilema has the law process functioning at a low level. More information available later.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

COURT CONFIRMATION

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE

PLAINTIFF


CURTIS ADLER

V.

DEFENDANTS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ORANGE COUNTY

SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY



THE DILEMA'S SOLUTION; CONSTITUTION INTELLIGENCE PARTY

Constitution Intelligence Party is multi-device system for maximum function of the law process. The multi-device system would support the constitution, code, and procedures eliminating clerical ~~errors~~ and e.t.c. More information available at trial.